

if has anybody has ever been sick, if anybody ever been found to be sick, not one person has ever gotten sick by purchasing medications, name brand medications, from Canada.

The second argument that the industry puts out is somehow it will affect the research and development for new medications. The fact is the taxpayers, through the National Institutes of Health, have funded research into pharmaceutical drugs for \$27 billion a year. Second, they write off all their R&D investment and the taxpayers cover for them.

In my view, the taxpayers have been tremendously generous to the industry and to the development of new drugs and that all the new drugs, if we take a look at cancer, AIDS drugs, other types of medications, they have all been funded by taxpayer-paid research. So first the strawman made the argument about safety. In fact, the legislation we passed here in the House improved the safety by dealing with counterfeit.

Another issue is that somehow it impacts the development of new medication, life-saving medications. The fact is it does not touch it. I think we will maintain the tax credit for research and development, and we will continue to fund the National Institutes of Health to the tune of \$27 billion, and the taxpayers have been quite generous. In fact, what they are owed is a return on their investment.

So what I believe, and would hope that others have seen this article and know what they are having in their own district and as the conference meets here on the prescription drug bill, is that any piece of legislation that does not deal with price does not deal with the primary issue affecting the senior community and that we have an obligation to get them the best price and get the taxpayers the best price we can get them through a prescription drug bill that allows the free market to work. Because for too long we have had a closed market here. We need to open up the market and allow the principle of competition to work.

Second, and I think in addition to that, is that we talk about expanding Medicare. We need to ensure that for that \$400 billion we get the most for our money. Everybody today knows if they go to any senior center and talk to folks they will tell them, because there is somebody from their senior home who has gone over the border, gone into Canada and bought prescriptions filled out for everybody in the unit or everybody at the housing project, they have bought medications. We have turned our grandparents into drug runners, and that should not be illegal because what they are trying to do is meet the obligations they have for their own health.

For too long we have all heard stories of people who have cut medications in half, skipped a month so their spouse can get the medications they need. That is a health and safety risk.

This legislation that was passed out of this Congress with bipartisan majority would address that health and safety risk. It would address the need of our taxpayers who are more than willing to help get a prescription drug bill but not do it when we are paying inflated prices, sometimes as high as 60 percent, to the pharmaceutical industry. If someone takes one medication like Tamoxifen, which costs \$360 here in the United States, it fights what? Breast cancer. In Canada, it costs \$33.62. That is the difference, and it means life or death for a lot of the people here in this country.

I call on the conference to quickly pass a prescription drug bill that has this reimportation provision and ask that my colleagues look at the article the other day in USA Today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION'S STEEL POLICY IS WORKING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of President Bush's steel policy which was implemented in March, 2002, to provide the domestic steel industry with a 3-year safeguard program against a crushing surge of steel imports that had begun in 1998.

As chairman of the Congressional Steel Caucus, I have seen firsthand and heard testimony from many steel employers on the extent of the economic devastation that the industry suffered as a result of the import surge. In my view, President Bush took the courageous position to stand up for the steel industry and acted to help restore the steel industry to its competitive footing, something that, unfortunately, the previous administration had not chosen to do.

On September 19, the International Trade Commission issued a mid-term review of the 201 safeguard, which confirmed what many of us had predicted for some time, that President Bush's steel policy is working and showing substantial results. In short, the ITC mid-term review of the President's steel policy is a win for the administration and a win for steel employers and workers.

Since 2002, we have seen the domestic industry begin a heroic recovery and restructuring of the industry and groundbreaking new labor agreements. Yet critics of the steel program argue that steel consumers have unduly suffered from the tariffs imposed on se-

lected imports, and they have clamored for the elimination of the President's program. In my view, the ITC report quells those critics' voices and shows, demonstrating very clearly, that the section 201 safeguard has had minimal impact on the steel-consuming industries.

The ITC report reveals that the domestic steel industry has been doing the right things to get their companies into top shape so they could compete globally. Steel prices have stabilized at a sustainable level after an initial price spike immediately following the implementation of tariffs. This reaffirms the administration's policy and their decision to allow numerous exemptions from the tariff structure.

Serious attempts to restructure, reach groundbreaking agreements between management and labor and significant capital investments have been taken by industry, but, frankly, they cannot stop there. The 201 safeguard program must remain in place for the full 3 years and allow the industry to finish what it has begun and truly recover from devastating import surges.

Mr. Speaker, this really boils down to jobs. The 201 safeguard has stopped the hemorrhaging of jobs among steel producers, and the ITC report found that steel-consuming jobs have not been put at risk by this policy.

Since this most recent crisis in the steel sector began, over 54,000 steelworkers have lost their jobs and over 30 steel companies have had to close their doors.

We developed trade remedy laws like the 201 safeguard specifically to help our companies endure unfair import surges like the one that caused this crisis in the steel industry. We must not allow unfair foreign trade to push our steelworkers out of jobs and force more and more of our good-paying jobs offshore.

I am pleased that the ITC found at core that President Bush's steel policy is good for the industry, it is good for America, and it is good for America's industrial base. We must remain vigilant and police our markets for the sake of our steel industry, manufacturers, and the entire American economy.

I want to thank President Bush for standing up for steel, and I urge him to stick with it.

#### FUNDING FOR IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, next week the Congress will consider the President's request that we borrow \$87 billion and indebt the American people for the next 30 years to repay that 87 billion borrowed dollars on top of the \$79 billion that Congress borrowed last April to continue the actions in Iraq and build that country. And I say "build" because the President has asked for \$20.3 billion to build Iraq, not